

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/534,930	CAREY, MARCUS PATRICK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TARLA R. PATEL	3772	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) TARLA R. PATEL (3) Mr. William Smith

(2) Michael Phillips (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 17 June 2009

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 12

Identification of prior art discussed: Prior art of reference of Kovac and Rosenblatt et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Tarla R Patel/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3772

*Michael Phillips* Primary Examiner

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: A detailed discussion was made about template of Rosenblatt does not teach supports for vaginal wall and prevents substantial movement and displacement of the reinforcing material while the re-fixed vaginal epithelium heals, to these discussion and arguments the examiner agreed to withdraw the finality of last office action and would presented a non-final office action upon updated searches has been performed. Applicant is require to submit after final amendment or arguments as we discussed in this interview since the instant application stands an outstanding office action.